

## **REMARKS**

By virtue of this amendment, claims 1 and 4-20 are currently pending in this application. Claims 2 and 3 have been cancelled without disclaimer or prejudice.


In a December 2, 2004 Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of United States Patent 6,618,014. The applications respectfully traverse this rejection, but submit herewith a terminal disclaimer to expedite the allowance of the present application.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 11, 12, and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent Number 6,014,113 ("Orchard et al."). The applications respectfully traverse this rejection. However, to expedite the allowance of the present application. The recitations of claims 2 and 3 have been incorporated into claim 1. As claim 3 was only rejected for double patenting, which was obviated by the terminal disclaimer, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 as amended is now in condition for allowance. Claims 4-16 depend from claim 1 and, at least by virtue of the dependency, are believed to also be in condition for allowance.

Claim 17, as amended, contains limitations similar to amended claim 1 and, at least by virtue of the similarity, is believed to be currently allowable. Claim 18-20 depend directly from claim 17 and, at least by virtue of the dependency, are believed to be currently allowable.

If an extension of time under 35 C.F.R. § 1.136 is required to obtain entry of this Amendment, such an extension is requested. If there are fees due under 37 U.S.C. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 which are not otherwise accounted for, please charge our Deposit Account No. 08-2623.

Respectfully submitted this 8th day of February 2005.



---

Brian Kinnear, Reg. No. 43,717  
Attorney for Applicants  
HOLLAND & HART LLP  
555-17th Street, Suite 3200  
P.O. Box 8749  
Denver, Colorado 80201  
(303) 295-8170

3337256\_1.DOC